DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 537 FL 018 623

TITLE Numbers of Limited English Proficient Children: National State, and Language-Specific Estimates. Based on the 1982 English Language Proficiency Survey and Special Tabulations of the 1980 Census.

INSTITUTION Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.

PUB DATE Apr 87

NOTE 29p.

PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Demography; *English (Second Language); Identification; *Language Proficiency; *Limited English Speaking; Minority Groups; *Statistical Surveys

IDENTIFIERS *United States

ABSTRACT

Drawing on the 1982 English Language Proficiency Survey, where the English skills of students from language-minority households were compared with the skills of students from homes where only English was spoken, and on special tabulations of the 1980 census, this report presents estimates of national and state levels of the English proficiency of children from families where a language other than English is spoken. Approximately one-third of the school age children from homes where another language is used some of the time are distinctly limited in English. The numbers of limited-English-proficient (LEP) children vary substantially among states and across language groups. Variables generating model-based predictions of language-minority students' English proficiency included household education level, family income, nativity and recency of immigration, and parental judgement of children's abilities. Estimates based on the model indicated that there were significantly more LEP children in the United States than were estimated or identified by state education agencies. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED321537

NUMBERS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT CHILDREN: NATIONAL, STATE, AND LANGUAGE-SPECIFIC ESTIMATES

Based on the 1982 English Language Proficiency Survey
and Special Tabulations of the 1980 Census

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation

April 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL018623

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NUMBERS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT CHILDREN:
NATIONAL, STATE, AND LANGUAGE-SPECIFIC ESTIMATES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview..... 1

B. How the Estimates were Generated..... 1

C. The ELPS Sample..... 2

D. Test of English Proficiency Used In ELPS..... 2

E. The Standard of English Proficiency Used..... 2

F. Factors that Predict Performance on the Test..... 2

G. Why the Estimates Must Be Described as Synthetic..... 3

II. ESTIMATES OF THE NUMBERS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT CHILDREN BY HOME LANGUAGE

A. Practical Limitations on the Amount of Detail..... 5

B. Dependence on a Non-English Language for Language Minority Children..... 5

C. Developing Estimates by State and for Language Groups..... 7

D. Estimated Numbers and Proportions of Limited English Proficient Children, by Home Language..... 8

III. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT CHILDREN

A. Evidence of Concentration..... 9

B. Language Composition of Limited English Proficient Children in the Nine Largest States..... 10

C. Patterns of Geographic Concentration by Language..... 11

IV. PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF THE ESTIMATES

A. Comparison with the Judgments of Language-Minority Parents... 13

B. Comparison with Numbers of Limited English Proficient Children Identified by State Education Agencies..... 14

APPENDIX TABLES

1. Number of Language-Minority Children by State and Language
2. Number of Limited English Proficient Children by State and Language
3. Percent of Limited English Proficient Children by State and Language
4. Composition of State Estimates by Home Language
5. Distribution of Language Groups by State for Limited English Proficient Children

I. INTRODUCTION

Overview

Drawing on the 1982 English Language Proficiency Survey (ELPS) and special tabulations of the 1980 Census, this report presents estimates of numbers and proportions of children from families where a non-English language is spoken (language minority families) and who are limited English proficient (LEP). The report provides estimates at the national and State levels and for selected languages.

About one-third of all school-age children from homes where some use is made of a non-English language are distinctly limited in English proficiency. Proportions of limited English proficient children vary substantially across language groups and among States, and limited English proficient children tend to be concentrated in just a few States, although the specific pattern of concentration is different for some language groups.

The data presented represent estimates as of 1980. While most of the patterns revealed in these estimates are likely to still be valid in 1987, there are important exceptions to bear in mind. For example, most children from homes where an Indo-Asian language is spoken (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian and Thai) were recent immigrants in 1980, and this factor contributes heavily to the estimate of a 70 percent LEP rate for that group in 1980. Seven years later, the rate is likely to be substantially lower.

Another important factor is growth in the school-age language-minority population. Between April 1980 (the Census reference date) and October 1982 (ELPS), we estimate this population increased by a little over 7 percent, or from roughly 5 million to 5.3 million. Estimates of net growth from 1980 to 1987 are a matter of speculation since they depend largely on assumptions about the net migration of population from Mexico.

Methodological Concerns

How the Estimates were Generated. The 1982 English Language Proficiency Survey administered English language proficiency tests to 8,800 school-age children, 4,000 in language-minority households and the remaining 4,800 in homes where only English is spoken. Based on score distributions for English-only children, English proficiency cutoffs were estimated for each single year of age, 5 through 17. By means of multiple regression analysis of the data from language-minority children, models were then developed for predicting differential probabilities of scoring below these proficiency cutoffs, based on characteristics available in the 1980 Census.

Special tabulations of the 1980 Census data were then obtained which "profiled" each of the State and language-specific groups on the independent variables of the predictive models. By applying the models to these data-profiles, synthetic estimates were obtained of the numbers and proportions of language-minority children whose proficiency in English could be expected to fall below the specified percentile cutoffs.

The ELPS Sample. The ELPS sample was drawn from 1980 Census household records, and the sample was apportioned (or stratified) with a view to estimating specific language differences accurately. As a group, language-minority households were over-sampled by a factor of about 5, but within this group Spanish language households were undersampled in order to develop reliable estimates for each of the other 12 languages. Because of this allocation of the sample, it is possible to estimate language-specific differences in LEP rates. Since the primary purpose of ELPS was to identify a broad range of factors predictive of actual English language proficiency, the resulting loss of precision in direct estimates based on the ELPS data was judged to be acceptable.

Test of English Proficiency Used in ELPS.—The Language Measurement and Assessment Inventory (LM&AI) used in ELPS was developed earlier for the 1978 Children's English and Services Study. The LM&AI included a test for each age level from age 5 through 14 (ten in all). In ELPS, the test for 14 year-olds was also given to youths ages 15 through 17.

Census interviewers administered the 20-25 minute tests in the home at the same time that information on the household was obtained. For younger children, most of the test was orally administered, using pictures and flash cards to assess recognition and English vocabulary. At older ages, the test was exclusively written, with items designed to evaluate comprehension, punctuation, understanding of idioms, and mastery of syntax.

The Standard of English Proficiency Used in Developing Estimates. The Department believes bilingual education services should be targeted on children from homes where a non-English language is usually spoken and whose English is sufficiently limited that they could not be expected to make normal progress in school without special help. For native English speaking children, performance below the 20th percentile on tests of reading or math is often considered by educators to be indicative of the need for compensatory education. In fact, substantial numbers of language-minority children participate in compensatory education programs such as Chapter 1. The Department considers it appropriate to apply the same standard of English proficiency in determining need for special bilingual education services among children genuinely dependent on a non-English language.

Factors that Predict Performance on the Test. In developing the model for estimating performance on the test (and thus numbers of children by State and language), the following variables are the principal ones used. These variables generated model-based predictions of whether a language-minority child was likely to score below the specified standard of English proficiency:

- Education of household or family head.
- Family income.
- Child's relative progress in school--a comparison of the child's age with the grade in which the child was enrolled at the time of the survey.
- Nativity and recency of immigration.

- o Origin of Spanish language households--whether native U.S. or Cuban, Puerto Rican, Mexican, or other foreign origin.

- o Household respondent's judgments of how well the child and the household head speak English--"very well" and "well" versus "less than well," including "not at all."

- o Membership in specific language groups--selected language groups, including American Indian, which exhibit significantly above or below-average LEP rates when controlling for other variables in the predictive equation.

Why the Estimates of LEP Children Must be Described as Synthetic. Numbers of language-minority children are directly available from published tabulations of the 1980 Census data, but our estimates of LEP children are synthetic because they are generated by applying findings from tested children in ELPS to children represented in the 1980 Census who were never tested. In this respect our estimates may be understood as an answer to the following hypothetical question:

> Assuming that the factors found to be predictive of limited English proficiency within the 1982 ELPS data were uniformly operative in 1980, how would the language-minority children in each of the 714 combinations of 51 States (including D.C.) and 14 home languages have performed on the same tests?

Detailed synthetic estimates are vulnerable to two types of errors: some of the factors that influence the characteristic being estimated may not have been identified (errors of omission in the predictive model), and certain of the identified factors may operate differently within particular subgroups (errors attributable to the heterogeneity of the population being estimated).

For example, the model predicts low score rates in cases where the household respondent (usually a parent) expressed the judgment that the child speaks English "not well." Some parents judge their children by relatively lenient standards while other parents are more exacting. If there were large differences in this respect among State and language-specific subgroups -- differences not systematically correlated with other predictive variables in our model (such as the parents' educational attainment) -- our estimates of LEP rates would be correspondingly distorted. In fact, however, much of the variance in severity of parental judgment is captured by other variables in our model, including specific language differences and, for Spanish speakers, the Spanish origin variable.

II. ESTIMATES OF THE NUMBERS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT CHILDREN BY HOME LANGUAGE

Table 1 provides direct estimates from the 1980 Census of the number of language-minority children in each language group.

As the table shows, children from Spanish-language homes outnumber the next largest group (French) by a factor of 14. This means that the accuracy of our estimates of total LEP children for individual States is largely determined by the success of our model in predicting the performance of Spanish-language children. Of interest in this connection is the Spanish origin variable (Mexican/Puerto Rican/Cuban/Other) in our predictive model. Relatively large and highly significant differences were observed in ELPS among tested Spanish-language children by type of origin, and these differences contribute to the probable accuracy of the State-specific estimates.

Table 1

Number of School-Age Language-Minority Children by Language Group, U.S., 1980

Language	Number	Percent of Total
Spanish	3,113,100	62.8%
French	222,600	4.5%
Italian	215,000	4.3%
German	184,700	3.7%
Chinese	133,600	2.7%
Filipino	130,700	2.6%
Greek	78,400	1.6%
Portugese	75,700	1.5%
Korean	66,000	1.3%
Polish	61,600	1.2%
Japanese	44,100	.9%
Amer.Indian languages	109,000	2.2%
Indo-Asian languages	91,300	1.8%
Other	429,100	8.7%
Total, all languages	4,955,000	100%

SOURCE: Special tabulation of the 1980 Census (15 percent sample data).

Note: Children ages 5-17 are counted as language-minority if the Census reference person (generally the household head) and one other household member (not necessarily the child in question) are reported to speak a non-English language.

Practical Limitations On the Amount of Detail. The U.S. Census Bureau recognizes about 400 different languages, and Census publications provide data for up to 70 language groups. In this report, we present estimates for the 11 largest language groups, plus two composite categories and a residual. Considering the tendency for language groups to cluster in particular States, even 14 language categories is probably excessive. For example, the smallest of our specific language groups (Japanese) is represented by just 44,000 school-age children, and 60 percent of these children are located in just three states -- California, Hawaii, and New York. This means the average number of Japanese children represented in the Census Bureau's sample in each of the remaining states is about 50, a perilously small sample for applying a complex model to estimate the number of these children who might have tested out as limited in English.

State coordinators of bilingual education programs might desire greater detail. For example, Arabic, Turkish, and other Middle-Eastern and African languages are included in the large "all other" residual category. In some States, the residual is estimated to account for more than a quarter of all LEP children. The Indo-Asian category poses similar problems, since it embraces four or five distinct languages and accounts for significant fractions of the LEP population in ten States (see Appendix Table 5). Some 200 languages are subsumed under the American Indian category. Finally, one of the "specific" languages included in our analysis -- Filipino -- is arguably a collection of discrete tribal languages. Given statistical constraints, however, such detailed estimates cannot be provided.

Dependence on a Non-English Language for Language Minority Children. A common mistake among casual readers of reports on language minority children is to assume that all such children make use of the non-English "home" language (i.e., that they commonly speak and are spoken to at home in that language.) As a result of a series of specific language questions in the ELPS survey, we know that this is not true, and the detail is sufficient to construct an approximate scale of dependence on the child's "home" language. We put home in quotes here because by ordinary standards, the child's home language is the one usually spoken. As Table 2 shows, however, for 40 percent of language-minority children, the usual language spoken at home is English (Line 4: 100% - 60.1% = 39.9%).

Relative to the 11 indicators in Table 2, the questions of particular interest in assessing non-English language dependency are these:

- Does the child speak the non-English language at home? As line 2 shows, 19 percent do not.
- Is the non-English language the one usually spoken at home? As already noted (line 4), for 40 percent of language-minority children, only secondary use is made of the non-English language.

Table 2

Eleven Non-English Language Indicators, Their Prevalence Among Language-Minority Children, and LEP Rates under the 20th Percentile Associated with Each of these Indicators

(English Language Proficiency Survey, 1982)

Non-English Language Indicators	Percent of all language minority children	Percent scoring under the 20th percentile
1. The non-English language (N.E.L.) is the usual or second-often spoken household language.....	100.0%	45%
2. Child speaks N.E.L. at home.....	81.1%	49%
3. N.E.L. is the mother tongue (age 14-17) or N.E.L. is the usual household language (5-13).....	64.6%	52%
4. N.E.L. is usual household language (all ages, 5-17).....	60.1%	53%
5. Household head speaks N.E.L. with children in the household.....	59.3%	54%
6. Child born outside U.S.....	25.2%	57%
7. English not a household language.....	15.8%	72%
8. Child speaks N.E.L. with friend.....	13.8%	70%
9. Child entered U.S. in last 5 years.....	11.5%	69%
10. Child judged to speak English "not well" (by household respondent)....	5.7%	94%
11. Child judged to speak English "not at all" (by household respondent)..	.7%	98%

SOURCE: Special tabulation of the English Language Proficiency Survey file, OPBE/PES/PTAD, November, 1985

- Is English not often used in the home? This is the case for just 16 percent of the language-minority children (line 7). Thus, for 84 percent of the children, English is at least a second often-spoken household language.

Just 6 percent of all language-minority children are judged by the household respondent -- usually a parent -- to speak English "less than well" (Line 10).

Developing Estimates by State and for Language Groups. The 1980 Census did not include questions about usual and secondary languages, but only whether each individual member spoke a language other than English at home (as opposed to only speaking English). In consequence, when developing the estimates by State and language, which use 1980 Census data, we have had to employ a different definition of language minority. In place of detailed information on language dependency, we relied on ELPS for estimates of the proportions of language-minority children who are both limited in English (using the 20 percentile standard already discussed) and genuinely dependent on the non-English home language). In both cases, we have striven for equivalence of results. Specifically:

- Definition of Language Minority. Our 1980 Census definition of language minority (children in households where the head and at least one other member is reported to make use of a non-English language) yields approximately the same population estimates as would have been obtained if information on usual or second household had been available. Direct evidence on this point comes from ELPS, since both types of questions were asked in that survey.

- Limited Proficiency in English and Dependence on a Non-English Language. The Department believes that bilingual education services should be targeted on children with a significant degree of dependence on a non-English language defined as at least five non-English language indicators as set forth in Table 2 above. As the table shows, 59.3 percent of all language minority children meet this standard of dependence, and 54 percent of these children are LEP under the recommended 20th percentile standard of English proficiency.

  As applied to the population of all language-minority children, this yields a net LEP rate of 32 percent (54 percent of 59.3 percent). Our detailed LEP estimates for the 714 combinations of 14 languages and 51 States yield a national total of 1,752,000 children. This amounts to 35 percent of the Census-estimated language-minority population, or slightly over the benchmark figure of 32 percent estimated from ELPS.

Estimated Numbers and Proportions of Limited-English-Proficient Children by Home Language. Table 3 displays synthetic estimates based on the application of our predictive model from ELPS to special tabulations of the 1980 Census. Note that expected LEP rates vary widely across the 14 language groups, from a low of 14 percent to a high of 70 (Italian versus Indo-Asian). In addition to language-specific effects observed in the ELPS data (and incorporated into our predictive model), these rates reflect differences in the statistical "profiles" of the various groups on the other Census variables in our model, such as nativity and recency of immigration.

Table 3

Numbers and Proportions of Language Minority Children Who Are Limited in English by Home Language

	Total Language Minority	Limited English Proficient	LEP as Proportion of Total
Spanish	3,113,000	1,271,000	.41
French	223,000	51,000	.23
Italian	215,000	30,000	.14
German	185,000	37,000	.20
Chinese	134,000	38,000	.28
Filipino	131,000	35,000	.27
Greek	78,000	14,000	.18
Portugese	76,000	24,000	.32
Korean	66,000	17,000	.26
Polish	62,000	11,000	.17
Japanese	44,000	8,000	.19
Amer.Indian languages	109,000	57,000	.52
Indo-Asian languages	91,000	64,000	.70
Other	429,000	96,000	.22
All	4,955,000	1,752,000	.35

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education -- estimates based on the application of a model (derived from results of the 1982 English Language Proficiency study) to special tabulations of the 1980 Census data.

III. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED-ENGLISH-PROFICIENT CHILDREN

Evidence of Concentration. Table 4 shows that the distribution of LEP children by State is strongly skewed: at the high end three States account for 61 percent of all LEP children, while the 31 States with the fewest contribute only 7 percent to the national total.

Table 4

Geographic Concentration of Limited-English Proficient Children
U.S., 1980

State share of national total	Number of States	Percent share	Number of LEP children
10 percent of more	3 1/	61%	1,078,000
2 to 5 percent	6 2/	20%	354,000
1/2 to 1.9 percent	11 3/	12%	202,000
Under 1/2 percent	31	7%	118,000

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education -- estimate based on the application of a model (derived from results of the 1982 English Language Proficiency study) to special tabulations of the 1980 Census data.

1/ California, New York, and Texas
2/ Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey and New Mexico
3/ Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The reader may note that there is a missing interval in the "State shares" categories; no State has a share amounting to from 5 to 10 percent of the national total. Illinois, ranks fourth with 4.6 percent, and New York, the third ranking State has 12.4 percent, preceded by Texas with 21.6 and California with 27.5 percent at the top of the list. Totals for all the States are presented in Appendix Table 2.

Language Composition of LEP Children in the Nine Largest States. The Spanish language group accounts for 72.6 percent of all LEP children. In Table 5, we see that the Spanish group is predominant within all nine of the largest States.

Table 5

Estimated Language Composition of Limited English Proficient Children for States with 2 percent or more of the National Total, 1980

	AZ	CA	FL	IL	MA	NJ	NM	NY	TX
Spanish	64%	81%	80%	74%	42%	72%	68%	73%	95%
French	--	--	5	1	9	1	--	3	--
Italian	--	--	1	2	6	6	--	5	--
German	--	1	2	2	1	2	--	1	--
Chinese	--	3	1	2	3	1	--	4	--
Filipino	--	4	1	2	--	2	--	1	--
Greek	--	--	1	2	3	2	--	2	--
Portuguese	--	1	--	--	25	4	--	1	--
Korean	--	1	--	1	1	1	--	1	--
Polish	--	--	--	3	1	2	--	1	--
Japanese	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
Amer. Indian	33	--	--	--	--	--	30	--	--
Indo-Asian	1	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	2
Other	1	4	4	7	5	6	--	8	1
All languages	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Numbers of LEP children (in 000s)	63	482	55	81	37	69	49	217	379

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education -- estimates based on the application of a model (derived from results of the 1982 English Language Proficiency study) to special tabulations of the 1980 Census data.

Texas ranks first in this respect with 95 percent of all LEP children in the State belonging to the Spanish language group. Arizona and New Mexico are distinguished by substantial fractions of American Indian children (33 and 30 percent, respectively) and Massachusetts is distinguished by Portugese children who amount to one quarter of all LEP children in the State. For detail on other States, see Appendix Table 4.

Patterns of Geographic Concentration by Language. Table 6 extends the list of States to include an additional five with appreciable shares of particular languages, and expresses the LEP children in each State as a percent of the total U.S. language group. Thus, for example, Table 6 tell us that the Portuguese children who comprise 25 percent of all LEP children in Massachusetts (from table 5 above) amount to 39 percent of all Portugese LEPs in the country.

California is clearly the standout State in this table with a predominant share of 7 of our 14 language categories. Nine States are distinguished by ten different languages within their LEP populations. Along with California, New York, Illinois, and New Jersey are especially notable in this respect. Systematic detail for all States is presented in Appendix, Table 5.

TABLE 6

Geographic Distribution of Limited-English Proficient Children by Home Language: U.S., 1980

Percent of Specified Language Groups

Language	States with 10 percent of more of a language group or with at least 35,000 LEP Children (2 percent of the total)														All Other States
	AZ	CA	FL	HI	IL	LA	MA	NJ	NM	NY	OH	PA	RI	TX	
Spanish	3	31	4	--	5	--	1	4	3	12	1	1	--	28	7
French	--	4	6	--	1	34	7	2	--	13	1	1	2	2	27
Italian	--	5	2	--	6	--	7	14	--	39	3	7	1	1	15
German	1	7	3	--	5	1	1	3	--	7	10	7	--	5	50
Chinese	1	42	2	2	3	--	3	2	--	21	1	2	--	4	17
Filipino	--	48	2	19	6	--	--	3	--	4	1	1	--	2	15
Greek	1	6	3	--	13	--	8	7	--	30	4	5	--	2	21
Portugese	--	16	1	--	--	--	39	13	--	6	--	1	14	--	10
Korean	1	34	1	4	7	--	1	4	--	9	1	4	--	4	30
Polish	1	2	1	--	21	--	5	11	--	18	4	6	1	3	27
Japanese	--	36	1	13	4	--	1	5	--	12	1	1	--	4	22
Amer. Indian	36	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	26	1	--	--	--	1	34
Indo-Asian	1	31	3	1	4	4	1	1	1	2	1	3	--	11	36
Other		21	2	2	6	1	2	5	--	18	5	7	--	3	28
All	4	27	3	1	5	1	2	4	3	12	1	2	0	22	13

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education -- estimates based on the application of a model (derived from results of the 1982 English Language Proficiency study) to special tabulations of the 1980 Census data.

VI. PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF THESE ESTIMATES

Comparison with the Judgments of Language-Minority Parents. From our analysis of the ELPS data, we know that parental judgments of how well the child speaks English make a significant contribution to predicting the child's actual performance on a test of English proficiency. Nevertheless, this is merely one of many variables that figures in our predictive model, so it is a matter of some interest to compare simple tabulations of this 1980 Census question with the much more complex estimates of LEP children derived from our model. Table 7 offers such a comparison just with respect to State shares of English-limited children, and only for the nine largest States. In this connection, the first thing to observe is that the same nine States have the largest shares on both measures.

Table 7

State Shares of National Totals of Children Limited in English under Two Different Definitions: U.S., 1980

	Percent of national totals		Rank on	
	Parent's Judgment*	Model-based LEP estimates	Parent's Judgment*	Rank on Model
Arizona	2.5%	3.6%	7	6
California	31.1%	27.5%	1	1
Florida	3.5%	3.2%	6	7
Illinois	6.0%	4.6%	4	4
Massachusetts	1.8%	2.1%	8	9
New Jersey	3.8%	3.9%	5	5
New Mexico	1.6%	2.8%	9	8
New York	11.7%	12.4%	3	3
Texas	20.3%	21.6%	2	2
Subtotal	82.2%	81.7%		
Remainder	17.8%	18.3%		
Total U.S.	100.0%	100.0%		
Number of children	653,600	1,752,400		

SOURCE: 1980 Census of Population, Vol. 1, Chapter C, and Appendix, Table 2.

* Children reported in the 1980 Census to speak English "less than well," as judged by the household respondent.

At least for the larger States, it appears from Table 7 that parents' judgments of how well the child speaks English, as reported in the 1980 Census, provide a relatively good indicator of relative shares of the LEP population. State ranks on the two measures never differ by more than one step, although the numbers from the model-based LEP estimates are two-and-a-half time higher than the numbers of children judged by parents to speak English "less than well."

Comparisons with LEP Children Identified by State Education Agencies.

Table 8 provides a comparison of the numbers of limited English proficient children reported to the U.S. Department of Education by State educational agencies with estimates by State derived from the ELPS model.

Table 8

Comparison of Numbers of Limited English-Proficient Children Identified by State Education Agencies and Estimated by Model

State	SEA reports*	Model-based estimates
Arizona.....	32,000	62,000
California.....	568,000	482,000
Florida.....	38,000	55,000
Illinois.....	54,000	81,000
Massachusetts.....	25,000	37,000
New Jersey.....	37,000	69,000
New Mexico.....	51,000	49,000
New York.....	141,000	217,000
Texas.....	274,000	379,000
Top 9 States Total	1,220,000	1,432,000
(Average of top 9)	(135,000)	(159,100)
Next 11 Model States**	124,000	202,000
(Average of next 11)	(11,300)	(18,400)
Remaining SEA States	84,000	94,000
(Average of other 22)	(3,800)	(4,300)
9 non-SEA States***	--	24,000
(Average of 9)	(-)	2,700)
Total, U.S.	1,428,000	1,752,000

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (compilation of State reports) and Appendix Table 2.

* Latest reports available as of March, 1987. These were predominantly for the 1984-85 school year, with some for 1985-86 and a few for 1983-84.

** These States are identified in the note accompanying Table 4 on page 12.

*** Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Maine, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, Utah, and West Virginia.

There are at least two reasons why we should expect smaller numbers of LEP children from State Education Agencies: only children enrolled in public school are covered by these estimates, and very small language groups may escape notice at the school level. In contrast, our model-based estimates cover the entire age-group 5-17 without regard to school enrollment, and include even the smallest numbers of children wherever they are found in the 1980 Census.

State Education Agency estimates of LEP children are not available from every State, but none of the nine missing States is estimated by our model to have a significant number of LEP children. Once again, the same nine large States appear at the top of both lists.

With respect to estimates from large States, California is the main exception to our hypothesis that SEA-reported figures would be lower. In all other respects, however, the comparisons accord with this hypothesis: both distributions are strongly skewed, with sharply descending averages for the four groups of States on the two measures. As a group, the nine States not reporting LEP enrollments account for just 1.4 percent of the total estimated by our model.

APPENDIX

SCHOOL-AGE LANGUAGE-MINORITY CHILDREN
BY STATE AND LANGUAGE

Appendix Table 1

STATE	CHINESE	SPANISH	FILIPINO	FRENCH	GERMAN	ITALIAN	JAPANESE	KOREAN	POLISH	INDOASIA	PORTUGESE	GREEK	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
AL	222	1734	112	777	1272	237	120	186	49	489	36	204	77	1060	6575
AK	37	802	374	178	392	118	228	369	30	72	5	62	9276	541	12484
AZ	914	107340	413	853	1711	986	168	451	390	645	140	434	36681	2268	153394
AR	207	1235	47	330	487	73	20	93	84	651	0	43	63	684	4017
CA	54827	918430	61272	10951	19784	14162	17427	21156	1513	28755	14041	6218	2675	82275	1253486
CO	574	53576	180	1049	3669	672	704	768	250	1528	46	438	841	3044	67339
CT	768	33184	477	9854	2730	13066	180	343	3616	746	5271	2024	297	6530	79086
DE	187	1871	243	113	386	483	58	103	191	82	32	227	24	1152	5152
DC	267	2000	116	546	221	119	53	28	15	36	43	124	0	550	4118
FL	1855	157773	2485	9620	5218	5100	518	787	697	2486	847	2439	514	9761	200100
GA	905	5690	253	1363	2247	292	381	1036	80	697	127	488	57	3245	16861
HI	3293	1629	20229	297	324	57	8824	2029	17	1248	87	16	13	8271	46334
ID	72	7084	24	185	600	52	111	97	14	177	78	87	689	777	10047
IL	5097	139951	9008	3407	11316	13671	1588	4977	12646	3411	244	10263	453	30064	246096
IN	648	14622	566	729	7591	514	196	492	1066	909	101	1001	72	6600	35107
IA	338	3000	143	227	2226	167	118	164	62	1481	26	315	208	2122	10597
KS	514	9204	256	392	2949	75	94	423	44	1502	41	122	139	1477	17232
KY	168	1551	203	454	1114	187	67	346	47	601	37	111	73	1484	6443
LA	559	9221	236	66506	847	548	132	256	35	3765	103	287	138	2618	85251
ME	61	337	57	18756	258	161	20	39	42	92	86	228	317	496	20950
MD	2688	9195	2145	3001	3491	1989	457	3626	662	1207	667	2465	196	9262	41051
MA	4240	32514	407	17075	2429	14602	362	844	3281	887	27170	6591	220	10568	121190
MI	1973	24815	2080	2421	6982	7485	565	1631	6750	1883	276	3012	757	25646	86276
MN	677	3279	341	820	5654	267	235	541	640	3148	43	252	1127	6329	23353
MS	264	1168	215	687	451	190	19	108	6	538	48	81	1273	812	5860
MO	857	5346	707	636	3201	1072	274	418	169	1031	38	473	139	3641	18002
MT	44	746	34	138	966	59	73	19	36	194	13	52	2660	465	5499
NE	71	3848	65	168	1254	243	110	211	234	476	28	132	376	1402	8618
NV	487	7845	353	162	652	479	71	344	76	264	79	67	486	942	12307
NH	127	594	40	10600	510	184	11	33	170	12	111	644	38	704	13778
NJ	4678	118457	5005	4475	8099	29006	1555	2803	6773	884	9278	5882	622	25620	223137
NM	205	110587	96	304	778	250	69	56	41	496	24	140	27743	748	141537
NY	26869	379925	6113	27227	17200	77914	3708	6839	10788	2314	4785	20000	1602	78924	664208
NC	649	3920	256	1237	1745	361	357	533	79	779	45	916	336	2754	13967
ND	63	484	44	163	6645	18	8	27	95	81	12	2	897	1314	9853
OH	1744	19171	1595	2141	13092	6560	504	1562	2275	1063	314	3581	315	21908	75825
OK	462	8032	155	474	1186	88	79	315	5	1494	0	95	5292	1803	19480
OR	1119	8233	549	462	2147	149	446	687	55	2775	64	163	382	3405	20636
PA	2828	33150	1451	2198	10450	14643	351	2666	3822	2510	993	3854	73	25460	104449
RI	219	3354	139	5139	289	2725	54	159	451	338	9051	309	27	1334	23588
SC	272	2413	880	1182	1105	206	87	233	59	318	83	301	52	1418	8609
SD	69	315	23	87	3216	18	36	26	3	101	4	39	5567	589	10093
TN	612	1901	221	730	1455	168	186	328	112	732	63	151	36	1955	8650
TX	4432	811122	2447	5932	9267	1604	1137	2244	1494	9663	407	1231	817	14511	866308
UT	598	8816	93	577	2028	140	323	105	10	992	115	457	3208	3029	20491
VT	10	191	0	3235	357	157	2	56	61	8	2	27	7	297	4410
VA	1806	9318	3926	2876	3307	1194	399	2882	152	2704	317	1175	224	6787	37067
WA	3045	18707	3675	897	3973	761	1366	2105	151	3687	197	420	878	6400	46262
WV	171	595	333	207	432	448	45	30	90	91	4	173	78	1043	3740
WI	668	11422	642	677	6522	1274	119	387	2117	1263	70	553	515	4849	31078
WY	113	3376	0	128	454	53	54	33	39	32	0	50	464	196	4992
TOTAL	133573	3113073	130724	222643	184679	215047	44069	65994	61584	91338	75692	78419	109014	429134	4954983

ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF LEP CHILDREN BY STATE AND LANGUAGE

Appendix Table 2

STATE	CHINESE	SPANISH	FILIPINO	FRENCH	GERMAN	ITALIAN	JAPANESE	KOREAN	POLISH	INDOASIA	PORTUGESE	GREEK	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
AL	96	394	20	169	255	30	41	31	11	329	4	17	28	209	1634
AK	10	166	120	24	53	6	66	129	6	27	1	7	4966	115	5696
AZ	268	40108	151	123	305	112	23	142	55	401	25	99	20329	387	62528
AR	60	414	20	79	154	12	3	26	13	495	0	8	37	198	1519
CA	16006	387942	16872	1944	2748	1423	2965	5731	162	19635	3868	860	1126	20204	481486
CO	200	17841	60	227	694	88	113	252	38	1161	16	65	399	692	21846
CT	109	15438	110	1969	397	1908	39	47	700	551	1615	324	111	1113	24431
DE	13	753	31	19	115	86	13	29	27	37	12	38	13	287	1473
DC	105	573	28	76	50	12	10	8	1	32	9	32	0	135	1071
FL	589	44515	597	2969	955	668	93	232	113	1648	175	454	238	2170	55416
GA	319	1353	71	249	503	32	112	314	18	421	30	70	23	788	4303
HI	906	360	6706	76	44	6	1095	634	1	844	14	0	6	2290	12982
ID	25	3097	7	28	101	4	11	24	2	135	6	18	367	125	3950
IL	1237	59934	1973	663	1740	1828	360	1177	2271	2348	40	1751	185	5840	81347
IN	112	5411	126	120	2770	57	50	110	197	673	20	226	32	1860	11764
IA	117	1088	26	54	700	30	26	46	13	1194	16	52	91	470	3923
KS	156	3310	57	92	686	12	30	119	7	1202	8	13	70	314	6076
KY	16	444	36	93	314	11	16	100	10	375	7	19	40	367	1848
LA	111	2357	58	17095	193	78	26	70	6	2695	22	43	70	617	23441
ME	5	79	11	4425	47	12	2	5	5	60	10	23	143	82	4909
MD	622	1958	431	543	596	193	102	908	88	685	194	367	65	1558	8310
MA	1291	15851	69	3504	340	2132	60	202	547	681	9429	1162	100	2018	37386
MI	503	8577	366	407	1288	848	124	297	1008	1368	57	429	309	6284	21865
MN	275	1079	90	176	1250	24	50	124	133	2493	5	41	533	1245	7518
MS	47	316	46	181	96	22	5	15	2	374	13	12	655	239	2023
MO	329	1444	149	100	841	159	75	92	48	684	13	96	66	989	5085
MT	3	219	16	29	283	7	8	5	9	187	0	10	1298	100	2174
NE	30	1401	14	23	236	33	41	43	42	313	9	30	188	279	2682
NV	146	2789	134	24	119	64	15	116	14	172	6	11	233	236	4079
NH	23	167	9	2217	79	14	4	11	30	8	34	117	13	95	2821
NJ	776	49232	1054	899	1132	4251	393	612	1189	522	3018	1034	246	4426	68784
NM	57	33384	16	43	121	15	7	11	2	404	4	21	14751	124	48960
NY	8060	157370	1300	6434	2684	11530	977	1611	1934	1487	1379	4113	656	17493	217028
NC	185	987	74	260	340	40	107	154	12	490	5	187	160	493	3494
ND	18	160	7	50	1695	2	3	5	27	56	1	0	415	311	2750
OH	389	7003	327	369	3682	890	122	251	391	739	70	598	139	5208	20178
OK	98	3259	50	112	249	5	15	83	0	1053	0	16	2590	477	8007
OR	380	3017	166	114	348	11	86	175	9	2007	9	37	187	1009	7555
PA	835	14745	297	357	2478	2093	88	639	591	1721	325	720	33	6299	31221
RI	33	1423	41	1008	51	342	9	27	84	276	3248	55	10	298	6905
SC	56	539	229	283	177	11	21	72	6	173	22	42	27	308	1966
SD	22	82	8	15	1181	9	7	3	1	73	0	3	2925	141	4470
TN	121	374	61	178	433	15	52	74	21	529	14	16	15	568	2471
TX	1347	361447	685	1267	1859	194	331	717	298	6698	74	223	400	3201	378741
UT	295	2597	24	113	323	12	51	35	1	761	8	44	1777	655	6696
VT	0	51	0	758	57	13	0	20	8	3	0	3	4	60	977
VA	465	1946	974	501	536	122	92	751	21	1628	72	194	111	1508	8921
WA	942	8083	1074	174	691	76	225	639	25	2753	42	71	410	1321	16526
WV	20	113	61	54	89	71	12	2	9	32	1	25	26	152	667
WI	151	4314	122	122	1307	146	26	77	397	1052	21	73	231	961	9000
WY	38	1063	0	17	73	4	18	16	6	9	0	5	226	47	1522
TOTAL	38017	1270567	34974	50826	37458	29763	8220	17013	10609	63694	23971	13874	57073	96366	1752425

ESTIMATED LEP RATES BY STATE AND LANGUAGE

Appendix Table 3

STATE	CHINESE	SPANISH	FILIPINO	FRENCH	GERMAN	ITALIAN	JAPANESE	KOREAN	POLISH	INDOASIA	PORTUOESE	GREEK	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
AL	43	23	18	22	20	13	34	17	22	67	11	8	36	20	25
AK	27	21	32	13	14	5	29	35	20	38	20	11	54	21	46
AZ	29	37	37	14	18	11	14	31	14	62	18	23	55	17	41
AR	29	34	43	24	32	16	15	28	15	76	0	19	59	29	38
CA	29	42	28	18	14	10	17	27	11	68	28	14	42	25	38
CO	35	33	33	22	19	13	16	33	15	76	35	15	47	23	32
CT	14	47	23	20	15	15	22	14	19	74	31	16	37	17	31
DE	7	40	13	17	30	18	22	28	14	45	38	17	54	25	29
DC	39	29	24	14	23	10	19	29	7	89	21	26	0	25	26
FL	32	28	24	31	18	13	18	29	16	66	21	19	46	22	28
GA	35	24	28	18	22	11	29	30	23	60	24	14	40	24	26
HI	28	22	33	26	14	11	12	31	6	68	16	0	46	28	28
ID	35	44	29	15	17	8	10	25	14	76	8	21	53	16	39
IL	24	43	22	19	15	13	23	24	18	69	16	17	41	19	33
IN	17	37	22	16	36	11	26	22	18	74	20	23	44	28	34
IA	35	36	18	24	31	18	22	28	21	81	62	17	44	22	37
KS	30	36	22	23	23	16	32	28	16	80	20	11	50	21	35
KY	10	29	18	20	28	6	24	29	21	62	19	17	55	25	29
LA	20	26	25	26	23	14	20	27	17	72	21	15	51	24	27
ME	8	23	19	24	18	7	10	13	12	65	12	10	45	17	23
MD	23	21	20	18	17	10	22	25	13	57	29	15	33	17	20
MA	30	49	17	21	14	15	17	24	17	77	35	18	45	19	31
MI	25	35	18	17	18	11	22	18	15	73	21	14	41	25	25
MN	41	33	26	21	22	9	21	23	21	79	12	16	47	20	32
MS	18	27	21	26	21	12	26	14	33	70	27	15	51	29	35
MO	38	27	21	16	26	15	27	22	28	66	34	20	47	27	28
MT	7	29	47	21	29	12	11	26	25	96	0	19	49	22	40
NE	42	36	22	14	19	14	37	20	18	66	32	23	50	20	31
NV	30	36	38	15	18	13	21	34	18	65	8	16	48	25	33
NH	18	28	23	21	15	8	36	33	18	67	31	18	34	13	20
NJ	17	42	21	20	14	15	25	22	18	59	33	18	40	17	31
NM	28	30	17	14	16	6	10	20	5	81	17	15	53	17	35
NY	30	41	21	24	16	15	26	24	18	64	29	21	41	22	33
NC	29	25	29	21	19	11	30	29	15	63	11	20	48	18	25
ND	29	33	16	31	26	11	38	19	28	69	8	0	46	24	28
OH	22	37	21	17	28	14	24	16	17	70	22	17	44	24	27
OK	21	41	32	24	21	6	19	26	0	70	0	17	49	26	41
OR	34	37	30	25	16	7	19	25	16	72	14	23	49	30	37
PA	30	44	20	16	24	14	25	24	15	69	33	19	45	25	30
RI	15	42	29	20	18	13	17	17	19	82	36	18	37	22	29
SC	21	22	26	24	16	5	24	31	10	54	27	14	52	22	23
SD	32	26	35	17	37	50	19	12	33	72	0	8	53	24	44
TN	20	20	28	24	30	9	28	23	19	72	22	11	42	29	29
TX	30	45	28	21	20	12	29	32	20	69	18	18	49	22	44
UT	49	29	26	20	16	9	16	33	10	77	7	10	55	22	33
VT	0	27	0	23	16	8	0	36	13	38	0	11	57	20	22
VA	26	21	25	17	16	10	23	26	14	60	23	17	50	22	24
WA	31	43	29	19	17	10	16	30	17	75	21	17	47	21	36
WV	12	19	18	26	21	16	27	7	10	35	25	14	33	15	18
WI	23	38	19	18	20	11	22	20	19	83	30	13	45	20	29
WY	34	31	0	13	16	8	33	48	15	28	0	10	49	24	30
TOTAL	28	41	27	23	20	14	19	26	17	70	32	18	52	22	35

ESTIMATED LANGUAGE COMPOSITION OF LIMITED-ENGLISH-PROFICIENT CHILDREN
BY STATE (Percent of State Total)

Appendix Table 4

STATE	CHINESE	SPANISH	FILIPINO	FRENCH	GERMAN	ITALIAN	JAPANESE	KOREAN	POLISH	INDOASIA	PORTUGESE	GREEK	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
AL	6	24	1	10	16	2	3	2	1	20	0	1	2	13	100
AK	0	3	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	87	2	100
AZ	0	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	33	1	100
AR	4	27	1	5	10	1	0	2	1	33	0	1	2	13	100
CA	3	81	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	4	100
CO	1	82	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	5	0	0	2	3	100
CT	0	63	0	8	2	8	0	0	3	2	7	1	0	5	100
DE	1	51	2	1	8	6	1	2	2	3	1	3	1	19	100
DC	10	54	3	7	5	1	1	1	0	3	1	3	0	13	100
FL	1	80	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	4	100
GA	7	31	2	6	12	1	3	7	0	10	1	2	1	18	100
HI	7	3	52	1	0	0	8	5	0	7	0	0	0	18	100
ID	1	78	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	9	3	100
IL	2	74	2	1	2	2	0	1	3	3	0	2	0	7	100
IN	1	46	1	1	24	0	0	1	2	6	0	2	0	16	100
IA	3	28	1	1	18	1	1	1	0	30	0	1	2	12	100
KS	3	54	1	2	11	0	0	2	0	20	0	0	1	5	100
KY	1	24	2	5	17	1	1	5	1	20	0	1	2	20	100
LA	0	10	0	73	1	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	3	100
ME	0	2	0	90	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	100
MD	7	24	5	7	7	2	1	11	1	8	2	4	1	19	100
MA	3	42	0	9	1	6	0	1	1	2	25	3	0	5	100
MI	2	39	2	2	6	4	1	1	5	6	0	2	1	29	100
MN	4	14	1	2	17	0	1	2	2	33	0	1	7	17	100
MS	2	16	2	9	5	1	0	1	0	18	1	1	32	12	100
MO	6	28	3	2	17	3	1	2	1	13	0	2	1	19	100
MT	0	10	1	1	13	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	60	5	100
NE	1	52	1	1	9	1	2	2	2	12	0	1	7	10	100
NV	4	68	3	1	3	2	0	3	0	4	0	0	6	6	100
NH	1	6	0	79	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	3	100
NJ	1	72	2	1	2	6	1	1	2	1	4	2	0	6	100
NM	0	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	30	0	100
NY	4	73	1	3	1	5	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	8	100
NC	5	28	2	7	10	1	3	4	0	14	0	5	5	14	100
ND	1	6	0	2	62	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	15	11	100
OH	2	35	2	2	18	4	1	1	2	4	0	3	1	26	100
OK	1	41	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	13	0	0	32	6	100
OR	5	40	2	2	5	0	1	2	0	27	0	0	2	13	100
PA	3	47	1	1	8	7	0	2	2	6	1	2	0	20	100
RI	0	21	1	15	1	5	0	0	1	4	47	1	0	4	100
SC	3	27	12	14	9	1	1	4	0	9	1	2	1	16	100
SD	0	2	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	65	3	100
TN	5	15	2	7	18	1	2	3	1	21	1	1	1	23	100
TX	0	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	100
UT	4	39	0	2	5	0	1	1	0	11	0	1	27	10	100
VT	0	5	0	78	6	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	100
VA	5	22	11	6	6	1	1	8	0	18	1	2	1	17	100
WA	6	49	6	1	4	0	1	4	0	17	0	0	2	8	100
WV	3	17	9	8	13	11	2	0	1	5	0	4	4	23	100
WI	2	48	1	1	15	2	0	1	4	12	0	1	3	11	100
WY	2	70	0	1	5	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	15	3	100
TOTAL	2	73	2	3	2	2	0	1	1	4	1	1	3	5	100

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF LEP CHILDREN BY LANGUAGE
(Percent of Totals)

Appendix Table 5

STATE	CHINESE	SPANISH	FILIPINO	FRENCH	GERMAN	ITALIAN	JAPANESE	KOREAN	POLISH	INDOASIA	PORTUGESE	GREEK	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER	TOTAL
AL	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
AK	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	0	0
AZ	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	36	0	4
AR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
CA	42	31	48	4	7	5	36	34	2	31	16	6	2	21	27
CO	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1
CT	0	1	0	4	1	6	0	0	7	1	7	2	0	1	1
DE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FL	2	4	2	6	3	2	1	1	1	3	1	3	0	2	3
GA	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
HI	2	0	19	0	0	0	13	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
ID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
IL	3	5	6	1	5	6	4	7	21	4	0	13	0	6	5
IN	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	1	2	1	0	2	0	2	1
IA	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
KS	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
KY	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
LA	0	0	0	34	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1
ME	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	5	1	1	1	3	0	2	0
MA	3	1	0	7	1	7	1	1	5	1	39	8	0	2	2
MI	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	2	10	2	0	3	1	7	1
MN	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	4	0	0	1	1	0
MS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
MO	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
MT	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
NE	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NH	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
NJ	2	4	3	2	3	14	5	4	11	1	13	7	0	5	4
NM	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	26	0	3
NY	21	12	4	13	7	39	12	9	18	2	6	30	1	18	12
NC	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
ND	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
OH	1	1	1	1	10	3	1	1	4	1	0	4	0	5	1
OK	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	0
OR	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
PA	2	1	1	1	7	7	1	4	6	3	1	5	0	7	2
RI	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	14	0	0	0	0
SC	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SD	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
TN	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
TX	4	28	2	2	5	1	4	4	3	11	0	2	1	3	22
UT	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0
VT	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VA	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	4	0	3	0	1	0	2	1
WA	2	1	3	0	2	0	3	4	0	4	0	1	1	1	1
WV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WI	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	2	0	1	0	1	1
WY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100